

**MEMORANDUM**

June 22, 2022

TO: Education and Culture Committee

FROM: Blaise DeFazio, Senior Legislative Analyst, Office of Legislative Oversight <sup>BD</sup>  
Vivian Yao, Legislative Analyst

SUBJECT: **Worksession on OLO Report 2022-5, *Community Use of Public Facilities*, and FY23 CUPF Operating Budget Follow-up**

**COUNCILMEMBERS PREVIOUSLY RECEIVED ELECTRONIC COPIES OF  
REPORT 2022-5 AND SHOULD HAVE IT FOR THE WORKSESSION.**

On June 27<sup>th</sup>, the E&C Committee will discuss OLO Report 2022-5, released on April 26<sup>th</sup>, and FY23 Community Use of Public Facilities (CUPF) FY23 operating budget follow-up items.

The following Executive Branch and agency staff are scheduled to be available at the worksession to provide comments and answer questions:

Community Use of Public Facilities	Ramona Bell-Pearson, Director Bill Polman, Manager Kareem Davis, Program Specialist
Montgomery County Public Schools	Adrienne Karamihas, Director, Division of Capital Planning and Real Estate Veronica Hill, Director, Division of Maintenance and Operations
Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission	Mike Riley, Director, Montgomery Parks Cliff Driver, Athletic Field Program Manager Haviz Adejo, Park Permit Supervisor

## **A. OLO Report 2022-5 Summary**

The report responds to the Council's request to understand the functions of the Community Use of Public Facilities (CUPF) and to examine CUPF's and other jurisdictions' before and after school childcare selection processes. The Executive Summary for Report 2022-5 appears on ©1. Comments on the report from Chief Administrative Officer Richard Madaleno are attached at ©4.

This report describes the history and structure of CUPF; reviews the facility reservation process; describes CUPF's facility reservation subsidy programs; examines the department's financial management; reviews before and after school childcare assistance for low-income families; summarizes CUPF's before and after school childcare selection process; and analyzes six before and after school childcare selection case studies linked to challenges identified by stakeholders. OLO's major findings are summarized below:

- Within the jurisdictions studied, they either have a department (within an agency) managing the use of government facilities or school facilities - but not both, like CUPF. In addition, other jurisdictions are supported by general funds; CUPF is supported by enterprise funds.
- The last comprehensive fee study for Community Use of Public Facilities occurred in 2002 and a 2019 Request for Proposals (RFP) did not yield qualified applicants. The RFP is now on hold, pending revisions.
- All before and after school childcare selection case studies used a formal RFP through a procurement office. Before CUPF's selection process was put on hold, it administered the selection process without a formal RFP or assistance from a procurement office.
- Stakeholders noted that CUPF's internal and external communication has room for improvement and while the subsidy programs have been effective, there is room for process improvement.
- For before and after school childcare, stakeholders suggested numerous changes for the provider selection process, requested standards for all providers to adhere to, noted that before and after school childcare should be viewed as part of other County/MCPS out-of-school time activities, and recommended streamlining the state and County childcare voucher systems for low-income students' families.

## **OLO Recommendations and Discussion Items**

Based on the findings of Report 2022-5, OLO has four recommendations and two discussion items:

### *Recommendations*

- 1. Reclassify the Program Specialist who handles CUPF outreach and communications to a Community Outreach Manager or a Communications Manager, to improve CUPF's internal and external communications.**

Based on stakeholder comments, CUPF desperately needs to address its internal and external communications. However, compared to other departments who communicate regularly with the public, CUPF lacks the proper position and grade to address the department's communication needs.

OLO is recommending that Council approve the County Executive's FY23-recommended restoration of CUPF's Program Specialist. In addition, add sufficient funding to reclassify the position to a Community Outreach Manager. It is estimated the additional reclassifying funding would be \$56,000. This would account for bringing in a mid-level person with experience. If approved as part of the FY23 budget, it is recommended that the reclassification process start immediately in FY22 so the position can start in early FY23. ***Update: recommendation was approved as part of the FY23 operating budget.***

**2. Create an all-encompassing, guidebook on everything related to community use.**

When performing research for the project, OLO found that CUPF's information for stakeholders was scattered through its website pages and in Interagency Coordinating Board packets. An example of a county with a central information in one place is Anne Arundel County Public Schools Community Use of School Facilities' easy-to-follow guidebook that details procedures, hours of operation, safety and security, and general standards/requirements, etc. CUPF has most of the items available on its website (outside of a safety and security policy) – but it would be easier for users to find if it were all in one place.

**3. Perform the before and aftercare selection with a Request for Proposals through a procurement office (either through the County or MCPS).**

While CUPF has admirably administered the selection process, there have been both legal and non-legal challenges to outcomes – with the last two legal challenges causing a pause in the process in 2018. A different approach could be a procurement office performing a formal, Request for Proposals that specifically outlines the applying childcare provider's expectations and costs to the County and/or MCPS – similar to the RFPs administered at all other studied jurisdictions through their respective procurement departments.

If the Council wishes, it could also include requirements such as setting ranges of fees for students. Furthermore, the RFP could include standardized expectations/guidelines for providers – including how much of a discount they are allowed to give students of MCPS teachers, first responders, etc.

The RFP process can vary, depending on County and MCPS needs. The RFP process could be two steps, in which all providers apply first to be qualified and then they can apply to individual schools through a simple RFP. The RFP process can be for each individual school. The RFP process may also combine bids with HHS and/or MCPS childcare programs or even combine multiple schools (to help cover costs at non-profitable schools).

**4. Consider a comprehensive study that goes beyond the proposed RFP fee study from 2019.**

All RFP requirements from 2019 should still occur, but even more could be studied/analyzed. Beyond the market survey, fee assumptions review, reimbursement rate assessment, expenditure history review, and interviews on existing policies/fees, the following can be explored:

- What would need to change to create a uniform user group across all facilities?
- How can the fee structure be easier for users to understand?
- What fees would look like if reduced or free use was incorporated, with funding contributions from the County and MCPS to cover the reduced or free use?
- What the costs are to maintain fields (MCPS, County, and Parks) and the appropriate fees needed?
- Whether MCPS facility use fees should go directly to MCPS (like Parks, using the new RecTrac software) and if MCPS should then reimburse CUPF?
- Whether the current reimbursement setup is efficient for all parties involved?
- Whether MCPS and the County should have their own separate community use departments, like other jurisdictions?
- What the recommended funding structure should be (enterprise, general funds, or both), based on an expanded review of jurisdictions beyond the scope of this OLO project?

*Discussion Items*

**1. Determine what type of department CUPF should be. Is it solely an enterprise department? Or is it providing a public service, such as libraries, and fees are not expected to cover all costs?**

As stated in the report, providing free use or reduced fees at CUPF has been at odds with balancing the budget solely using enterprise funds. Similar jurisdictions such as Fairfax County Public Schools, Orange County Public Schools, or Loudoun County Public Schools are general fund-based; they do charge fees, but the fees are not intended to completely cover all their expenses.

**2. Consider all options available to address affordable before and after school childcare.**

Based on how the County and organizations responded to childcare needs during the pandemic and how other jurisdictions address their low-income students and families, explore assistance options, such as:

- Remove facility fees at high FARMS and Title I schools but providers must adhere to lower, uniform rates.
- Create assistance directly through the before and after school program administrator, with an easy-to-follow process; the following options may be exclusive of each other:
  - Require a portion of provider revenues go towards a scholarship program.
  - Require a before and after school scholarship program without provider revenues.
  - Require a sliding scale fee system for all providers.
- Provide before and after school childcare transportation.

- Apply for more school or County administered 21<sup>st</sup> Century grants through the State of Maryland or other grants available for before and after school care. MCPS noted that administering more grants would require additional staff.

## **B. CUPF FY23 Operating Budget Follow-up Items**

The E&C Committee met on April 29 to review and make recommendations for the CUPF FY23 operating budget. The Committee reviewed recommendations in the OLO report that affected the Department's operating budget. As noted above, the Council added \$56,999 to support reclassification of an Outreach Specialist to an Outreach Manager, consistent with the Office of Legislative Oversight recommendation. In addition, the Department noted that funding to support a comprehensive study of fees and CUPF operations has already been programmed.

E&C Committee members requested that a session be scheduled in the summer to review the Office of Legislative Oversight report on CUPF and discuss other issues involving CUPF, including the proposed CUPF/MCPS MOU, field renovation, fee assistance programs, the Early Care and Education Coordinating Entity and selection process for before and after childcare, the implementation of MD Blueprint Legislation, and generally how the County should use public spaces to support policy goals.

Director Pearson has provided an update on CUPF operations since the April meeting, which is attached at ©7-9. Key highlights include:

- An extension to the expired Memorandum of Understanding between MCPS and CUPF was finalized on June 15, 2022, and CUPF will be able to make FY22 reimbursements of amounts owed to MCPS.
- Approximately \$155,000 will be available in the Facility Fee Assistance Program to support use in FY23, particularly for services in the later summer months and early fall. This includes the annual budgeted amount of \$75,000 and the rollover of ARPA FY22 special appropriation funding.
- Summer Fellows Isaac Matthias and Nathalie Kirsch will be supporting efforts to examine CUPF fees and operations. They will be collecting regional data about community use fees and operations for outdoor spaces and indoor facilities. The information gleaned will inform the winning bidder of the RFP to be issued in the fall.
- CUPF is continuing to chair an Out of School Time (OST) Work group, involving public agencies and private systems building organization, focused on improving and increasing OST activities in focus communities. Collaboration Council has engaged the Forum for Youth Investment to support planning around governance, sustainability, and coordination of funding and services among public and private organizations.

- MCPS is finalizing an RFP for a bid process for their early care centers, which is intended to be a model for their school-age before and after care bid process. Currently all bid processes related to childcare in MCPS facilities are run through the MCPS procurement office.

The packet contains the following attachments:

Executive Summary for OLO Report 2022-5

Chief Administrative Officer Richard Madaleno comments on OLO report

June 21 CUPF Update

Circle #

©1-3

©4-6

©7-9

# Community Use of Public Facilities

OLO Report 2022-5

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

April 26, 2022

This Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) report responds to Council's request to understand the functions of the Community Use of Public Facilities (CUPF) and to examine CUPF's and other jurisdictions' before and after school childcare selection processes. This report describes the history and structure of CUPF; reviews the facility reservation process; describes CUPF's facility reservation subsidy programs; examines the department's financial management; reviews before and after school childcare assistance for low-income families; summarizes CUPF's before and after school childcare selection process; and analyzes six before and after school childcare selection case studies linked to challenges identified by stakeholders.

### Department Structure

Created in 1978, the Interagency Coordinating Board (ICB) sets and approves policy for CUPF. CUPF is the Executive Branch office that administers the programs and activities necessary for the public use of facilities. These facilities include athletic fields, schools, public libraries, Regional Services Centers, the Silver Spring Civic Building, Council Office and Executive Office Buildings, and the Clarksburg Cottage. Unlike other jurisdictions studied, CUPF permits facilities for government *and* schools; other jurisdictions have separate departments permitting government and school facilities. CUPF is comprised of 36 positions over six sections: the Director's Office, Core Services, Finance, Silver Spring Civic Building, Information Technology, and Weekend/Evening Supervisors.

#### Communication

A common theme from stakeholders interviewed was that CUPF's external and internal communication has room for improvement. CUPF currently has a lower-level program specialist position that handles department communication.

### Facility Reservations

To receive a permit for a facility reservation, users are required to sign a Facility Use License Agreement, ensuring that users agree to the conditions of use for a government facility, along with payment terms. Users can request additional services at facilities for an additional fee such as equipment, use of a kitchen, a cafeteria worker, or security services. Similar to other jurisdictions, CUPF does not provide security at schools and government buildings for standard public use. However, staff at schools keep doors locked during school hours and after hours; they are only opened to allow users a fifteen minute window for entry.

#### Top Events for Public Use

Facilities	Event
Indoor School Facilities	Childcare
Silver Spring Civic Building	Conferences
Athletic Fields	Leagues
Libraries	Meetings
Regional Services Centers	Meetings
Other County Buildings	Meetings

*Note: From FY19; last full year of community use.*

#### Top Buildings/Fields for Public Use

Facilities	Building/Field
Indoor School Facilities	Richard Montgomery HS
Athletic Fields	Cabin John Regional Park
Libraries	Rockville Memorial
Regional Services Centers	Bethesda-Chevy Chase
Other County Buildings	Clarksburg Cottage

*Note: From FY19; last full year of community use.*

Like other jurisdictions, CUPF prioritizes the use of schools and government buildings, giving priority to the primary tenant, followed by childcare, Parent Teacher Association meetings and activities in schools, government bodies, other publicly supported programs, and high-volume use (sports leagues, weekly cultural/religious assembly, etc.) – before the public. Among the jurisdictions studied, Montgomery County is the only one that explicitly places childcare after the primary tenant for priority ranking. CUPF allows historical use, or the use of facilities/fields based on prior use, to the priority groups.

Users currently make facility reservations online through ActiveMONTGOMERY, interactive PDF data forms, and through static forms depending on the reservation needed. Starting in May 2022, all CUPF facility reservations will be performed online through ActiveMONTGOMERY, due to the County updating its online software from ACTIVENet to RecTrac for CUPF, the Department of Recreation, and Montgomery Parks. The new software’s advantages include greater functionality and flexibility, a relational database structure across all three department, and lower costs.

**Facility Reservation Subsidy Programs**

CUPF operates two subsidy programs that address the needs of low-income, disadvantaged constituents - the Community Access Program (CAP) for the Silver Spring Civic building (since 2012) and the Facility Fee Assistance Program (FFAP; since 2017). The CAP is traditionally funded at \$150,000 and provides financial assistance and increases opportunities to groups, organizations, and community members using the Silver Spring Civic Building. The FFAP is traditionally funded at \$75,000 and provides financial assistance for user groups that directly benefit vulnerable/at risk youth or limited income individuals and their families. Both programs were successful in distributing the funds in FY19, before the COVID-19 pandemic drastically reduced public facility use. CUPF did receive \$500,000 in additional FFAP funds during the pandemic to expand the availability of youth sports; all the funds were successfully distributed.

**Financial Management**

CUPF is financially structured as a self-sustaining enterprise fund through user fees, with an annual operating budget of \$8.5 million in FY22. However, other counties studied are general fund-based, with an emphasis on providing services to constituents – as opposed to ensuring user fees cover all costs. CUPF spends 65% of its budget on facility use reimbursements to Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) for utilities, custodial supplies, equipment, maintenance, and staff services. The remainder of CUPF’s budget is spent on staff (28%) and other operating costs (7%).

CUPF’s fee structure varies based on the type of facility and can be complicated for users to understand. The last comprehensive fee study occurred in 2002. A 2019 Request for Proposals (RFP) did not yield qualified applicants, and the RFP is now on hold, pending revisions. The 2019 proposed study was planned to cover a market survey, fee assumptions review, reimbursement rate assessment, an expenditure history review, and interviews on existing policies/fees.

Starting in FY14, CUPF had a significant, fee-based fund balance, and it drew from those funds to make a variety of investments to benefit the community at large, such as improving ballfields through additional maintenance and renovations. However, these investments ceased when the COVID-19 pandemic led to a sharp drop in revenues.

**Before and After School Childcare Assistance for Low-Income Families**

Families looking for before and after school childcare financial assistance in Montgomery County can apply for vouchers through the State of Maryland’s Child Care Scholarship and the Working Parents Assistance Program through the Department of Health and Human Services. Outside of the vouchers, providers can offer financial assistance such as a scholarship or a discount. Other jurisdictions studied have programs that benefit families seeking aid, *directly through the department administering the before and after school childcare program.*

<b>Fairfax County Government</b>	Use a sliding scale for fees, with lower income families paying less.
<b>Fresno County Public Schools</b>	Free for all students attending before and after school care.
<b>Orange County Public Schools</b>	A scholarship program is available to low-income students.



In addition, other jurisdictions studied commonly used federal 21<sup>st</sup> Century Grants to provide funding for before and after school programs at eligible Title I schools. Organizations in Montgomery County have applied and received funding through these grants, but the use of these funds by the County and MCPS has recently been limited.

## Before and After School Childcare Selection Process

CUPF has administered the before and after school childcare selection process since 1986. It has been governed by Executive Regulation 6-17 AM, which dictates the bid schedule (every seven years), communication, the selection committee makeup, evaluation criteria, the appeal process (including remedies), and complaint management. The selection process has been on hold since the fall of 2018 due to two reasons:

1. Conflicting litigation contesting the validity of the process, especially regarding giving sufficient priority to non-profit providers (as required by the State of Maryland). In one case, the judge ruled in favor of the non-profit provider, and in the other case the judge ruled in favor of CUPF.
2. The executive regulation expiring in 2019, giving CUPF and MCPS an opportunity to revise the regulation.

A new executive regulation is not yet in place, but CUPF and MCPS have been meeting about a new process, looking at comparable jurisdictions, and discussing pertinent issues, such as security, for permit holders.

## Before and After School Childcare Selection Case Studies

OLO reviewed five counties that have a before and after school care selection process (Baltimore County, MD; Charles County, MD; Frederick County, MD; Orange County, FL; and Prince George's County, MD) and for comparison purposes, one county that runs its own before and after school childcare program (Fairfax County, VA). *Key findings from the childcare selection case studies:*

- All used a Request for Proposals
- A procurement department conducted the bid for all case studies
- Bid cycles varied from five years to "as needed"
- Two MD counties exclusively select non-profit providers – Baltimore and Frederick

Of note, the Fairfax County-run program does not pay facility fees to Fairfax County Public Schools, but it does pay \$1 million annually to offset supplies and operating expenses. The program uses dedicated school space. Principals are not involved in the operations, but other school staff are.

## OLO Recommendations and Discussion Items

### Recommendations

- 1 Reclassify the Program Specialist who handles CUPF outreach and communications to a Community Outreach Manager or a Communications Manager, to improve CUPF's internal and external communications.
- 2 Create an all-encompassing guidebook on everything related to community use.
- 3 Perform the before and aftercare selection with a Request for Proposals through a procurement office (either through the County or MCPS).
- 4 Consider a comprehensive study that goes beyond the proposed RFP fee study from 2019.

### Discussion Items

- 1 Determine what type of department CUPF should be. Is it solely an enterprise department? Or is it providing a public service, such as libraries, and fees are not expected to cover all costs?
- 2 Consider all options available to address affordable before and after school childcare.

For a complete copy of OLO-Report 2022-5, go to:  
<http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/OLO/Reports/CurrentOLOReports.html>



OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Marc Elrich  
*County Executive*

Richard S. Madaleno  
*Chief Administrative Officer*

MEMORANDUM

April 19, 2022

TO: Chris Cihlar, Director  
Office of Legislative Oversight

FROM: Richard S. Madaleno, Chief Administrative Officer *BSM*

SUBJECT: Draft OLO Report 2022-5: Community Use of Public Facilities

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Office of Legislative Oversight's (OLO) Report 2022-5: Community Use of Public Facilities.

As the report indicates, Community Use of Public Facilities (CUPF) has already done a great deal of work to collaborate with many users and stakeholders who benefit from the services that CUPF provides. During the pandemic, much was accomplished to establish a strong partnership with childcare providers. This enabled community members like first responders, health care workers, and other essential personnel to have childcare services. The continual efforts of CUPF to work closely with MCPS and childcare providers ensure health and safety standards are met. Facilitating the use of schools for childcare during a period when they are closed for other uses establishes a safe environment. CUPF also worked to ensure that outdoor facilities were made available for community use during the pandemic. This gave children and families access to recreational resources while relieving stress and providing healthy outlets. These successes during the pandemic were only possible because of a successful long-standing relationship between CUPF and MCPS.

Though the MOU in place between the County and MCPS relating to reimbursements expired in 2018, the reimbursements owed to MCPS have been paid through FY20. In FY21 at the CAO's request, MCPS forgave the reimbursements totaling \$2,587,415.00. A forgiveness of payment request has also been made for payments due in FY22 totaling \$2,203,634.00. To date, MCPS has not determined how it will handle this request. Upon a new MOU being put into place, CUPF will be able to pay the newly determined amount owed MCPS.

It is important to note that some of the shortfalls mentioned by the stakeholders or through conclusions drawn in the report are not matters under the control of CUPF. An example is the interrupted re-bid process for the selection of childcare providers in public schools. CUPF is solely involved to provide administrative support to MCPS in the operation of their childcare program. The program operations providing childcare services for MCPS students and families are discretionary to MCPS.

The draft report includes the following recommendations:

**Recommendation #1:** Reclassify the Program Specialist who handles CUPF outreach and communications to a Community Outreach Manager or a Communications Manager, to improve CUPF's internal and external communications.

**CAO Response:** CUPF staff has been working with OMB to discuss the possibility of reclassifying this position. There has been no final decision or recommendation from CUPF to OMB for this plan to be considered as part of the County Executive's budget proposal. CUPF will continue to assess its needs and priorities, and in coordination with OMB and OHR, may consider this reclassification.

**Recommendation #2:** Create an all-encompassing, guidebook on everything related to community use.

**CAO Response:** While CUPF has many publicly available resources, we agree that a comprehensive guidebook could be of value to the public. CUPF will work with the Interagency Coordinating Board (ICB) to review the feasibility of creating this interagency guide.

**Recommendation #3:** Perform the before and aftercare selection with a Request for Proposals through the Office of Procurement.

**CAO Response:** It is important to note that the childcare re-bid selection process and the provision of childcare services are solely MCPS operations. Should MCPS conduct the re-bids through a procurement process, their Procurement Office will handle the process. The Montgomery Office of Procurement would not be involved in any aspect of the procurements.

**Recommendation #4:** Consider a comprehensive study that goes beyond the proposed RFP fee study from 2019.

**CAO Response:** CUPF has reinstated a request made to the Office of Procurement in 2019 to reopen the RFP process for the purpose of trying to obtain bids for proposals. The earlier attempt made at the beginning of the pandemic was not successful in attracting qualified bidders for the study. In addition to working with Procurement, CUPF will participate in the Summer Fellows Program sponsored by the County Council. The two Fellows assigned to CUPF will develop data and information from outside sources regarding the permitting fees for fields as well as schools.

This data will be available for use by CUPF and, if necessary, to any contractor hired through the RFP for making recommendations about CUPF fee schedules. Should CUPF and the ICB not be able to develop a fee schedule from the Fellows' work, CUPF will have the option of engaging the RFP process for a more comprehensive study. This study would be performed by a successful bidder using information from both CUPF and the Summer Fellows.

We look forward to discussing these items further at the upcoming Council work session.

RM/rbp

cc: Fariba Kassiri, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer  
Ken Hartman, Director of Strategic Partnerships, Office of the County Executive  
Ramona Bell-Pearson, Director, Community Use of Public Facilities  
Jennifer Bryant, Director, Office of Management and Budget




## COMMUNITY USE OF PUBLIC FACILITIES

Marc Elrich  
*County Executive*

Ramona Bell-Pearson  
*Director*

June 21, 2022

**TO:** Vivian Yao  
Legislative Analyst

**FROM:** Ramona Bell-Pearson, Director   
Community Use of Public Facilities

**SUBJECT:** Updates for the Education and Culture Committee

The purpose of this memorandum is to update the Education and Culture Committee on progress and achievements that Community Use of Public Facilities (CUPF) has accomplished while working on many of the issues raised in the Office of Legislative Oversight Report that will be the subject of the June 27, 2022 work session.

CUPF is very happy to report that as a result of working collaboratively with MCPS, an extension of the expired MOU with MCPS was finalized on June 15, 2022. The Parties now have an extension of the MOU in place as of June 15, 2022 and CUPF will now be able to effect payment of the FY22 reimbursements owed to MCPS. Payment is also possible because CUPF is ending this fiscal year with a healthier enterprise fund due to the community returning to permit events in CUPF permitted spaces. The term of the extended MOU is June 15, 2022 through June 15, 2023 with the opportunity for further extension one time for a period of one year.

As related to the recommendations from the OLO report, CUPF has worked on those that could be addressed and put measures in place to achieve the recommended outcome. Many will be addressed in this memorandum while plans to address other recommendations will be discussed at the work session.

The field renovations are on schedule to get the \$300,000 recommended by the Executive and the ICB and approved by Council for FY23. There will be a reevaluation of CUPF's ability and obligation to pay related to FY24 later.

CUPF has \$75,000 for FFAP FY23 permitting plus much of the additional funding of \$125,000 which was recently approved by Council. Approximately two thirds of the

\$125,000 will be rolled over into FY23 as the funding appropriation made in FY22 came at a time in this fiscal year when the majority of grant applications submitted were for the later summer months and early fall which will occur in FY23.

CUPF has not done much work with the Early Care Initiative but instead has worked on another Initiative which is directly related to CUPF operations. That is the Out of School Time project. CUPF has been focused on the Out of School Time project to improve and increase opportunities for out of school time activities in focus communities throughout the County. The CUPF Director is currently acting as the chair of a Work Group comprised of Health and Human Services, Recreation, Office of Management and Budget, Montgomery County Public Schools, Council Staff, Collaboration Council, and Children's Opportunity Fund. The Forum for Youth Investment has been acting as a consultant to the Work Group providing support as we develop a plan for governance, sustainability and coordination between Agencies for services and funding.

MCPS is in the process of finalizing an RFP for a bid process for their early care centers which they intend to be used as a model for the school age before and after care bid process. Until further notice the before and after school bid process continues to be on hold. MCPS agreed last year to make all bid processes related to child care a procurement process that will be run by the MCPS procurement office with subject matter input from CUPF.

It is worth noting that the Maryland Blueprint Legislation has five policy goals, one of which CUPF is indirectly involved in through a partnership with MCPS: More Resources to Ensure that All Students are Successful. This goal includes before and after school supports for students, summer programming, social services integrated into out of school time and relevant community desired programming for students. CUPF has been partnering with public and private service providers in an attempt to make facilities available which in turn will make services for youths and their families available. While CUPF is not an agency that provides service programming there is still the opportunity to provide support to those programming efforts for focus group communities by providing access to facilities.

CUPF has been assigned two Summer Fellows who have been working with in the Wheaton office for approximately three weeks. They are Issac Matthias who is currently attending the University of Maryland and Nathalie Kirsch who is attending Georgetown University. They have been assigned the Project of collecting regional data about community use fees from Fairfax, Howard, Prince Georges Counties and the District of Columbia. Half of the project involves the collection of data related to permitting of outdoor spaces such as fields, courts, plazas, parks and other outdoor facilities. The other half is focused on indoor facilities such as schools, government buildings, recreation facilities, etc.

They have met with all of CUPF management and are meeting as needed with staff. This is being accomplished by holding individual 30 minute interviews with small

groups of staff to understand how CUPF operates and what is seen as objectives that their project should address. CUPF has provided background data from the 2020 OLO Summer Fellow report related to a comparative study of CUPF fees on a national level, past benchmarking done by Liz Haberman, Ron Maxson and Patricia Vitale, ICB resolutions, MCPS background materials, etc. The objective is to obtain data related to the local regional operations and fee schedules that will then be provided to inform the winning bidder for the RFP that CUPF will issue in the Fall of this year.

Through a partnership with the Collaboration Council, the Work group that CUPF is heading has engaged the services of The Forum for Youth Investment. This outside organization uses an Evidence Based Policy and Practice Initiative. This Initiative seeks to inform policymakers of how they can use evidence to improve equity and outcomes for all children, youth and their families. The Forum is providing frameworks that will allow the County Work Group to develop a model for operations and organization to ensure sustainability of OST planning and programming.

At the end of the five sessions of Group meetings, that have additional interspersed planning sessions for the steering committee, the Work Group will develop a plan of action that will be used to make recommendations to the County Executive and the County Council. The CUPF Director has also met with Raymond Crowel (Director of HHS), Chief Marcus Jones (Chief of MCPD), Robin Riley (Director of Rec), Dira Treadvance (Division Chief of CYF) and Luis Cardona (Manager of PYDI) to open a dialogue about the possibility of the out of school group becoming part of the Children, Youth and Families service provision through Positive Youth Development or another operational division of CYF. All were very supportive of the idea of incorporating the work with their existing efforts. Additionally, we discussed the need to provide more services for middle and high school students as well as incorporating more mental health components.

All in the Work Group have agreed that the ultimate outcome is to empower communities so that services and programming for the desired communities will be conceived and implemented by the subject community. Recommended next steps will be to invite the community members to the table to start discussions about what services and programming they want as opposed to committee members deciding for them. Studies have shown that the greatest sustainability and participation in this type of programming stems from ownership by the community being served. The community knows what is wanted and needed for their community. The objective this Initiative should be to assist them in meeting those desires and needs.

cc: Blaise DeFazio, OLO  
Ken Hartman, CEX Office